arXiv:1109.0956v3 [math.NT] 21 Nov 2011

Complements on Furtwängler′s second theorem and Vandiver′s cyclotomic integers

Roland Quême

2011 Nov 21

Contents

1 Introduction 2
1.1 General definitions and notations . . . 3
1.2 The aim of the article . . . 4

2 The main theorem 5
2.1 The general case . . . 7
2.2 The case $n \in \{p, 1, 2p, 2\}$ . . . 9
2.2.1 The two cases $n = p$ and $n = 1$. . . . 9
2.2.2 The cases $n = 2p$, $p > 3$, and $n = 2$ . . . 10
2.3 The case of non p-principal primes q . . . 12

3 On the second case of Fermat's Last Theorem 16
3.1 A conjecture for the second case of FLT . . . 17
3.2 Some properties of the primes q dividing $\frac{(x^p-y^p)(y^p-z^p)(z^p-x^p)}{(x-y)(y-z)(z-x)}$ . . . 19
3.3 Some properties of the primes q dividing $\frac{(x^p+y^p)(y^p+z^p)(z^p+x^p)}{(x+y)(y+z)(z+x)}$ . . . 23

Abstract

This article deals with a conjecture generalizing the second case of Fermat's Last Theorem, called $SFLT2$ conjecture: *Let $p > 3$ be a prime, $K := \mathbb{Q}(\zeta)$ the pth cyclotomic field and $\mathbb{Z}_K$ its ring of integers. The diophantine equation $(u + v\zeta)\mathbb{Z}_K = \mathfrak{w}_1^p$, with $u, v \in \mathbb{Z}\backslash\{0\}$ coprime, $uv \equiv 0 \mod p$ and $\mathfrak{w}_1$ ideal of $\mathbb{Z}_K$, has no solution.* Assuming that $SFLT2$ fails for (p, u, v), let q be an odd prime not dividing uv, n the order of $\frac{v}{u} \mod q$, ξ a primitive nth root of unity and $M := \mathbb{Q}(\xi, \zeta)$. The aim of this complement of the article [GQ] of G. Gras and R. Quême on the same topic, is to exhibit some strong properties of the decomposition of the primes $\mathfrak{Q}$ of $\mathbb{Z}_M$ over q in certain Kummer p-extensions of the field M with the aim to derive from them a conjecture implying SFLT2 and a weak conjecture implying that the SFLT2 equation can always take the reduced form $u + \zeta v \in K^{\times p}$.

Abstract

Cet article traite d'une conjecture généralisant le second cas du dernier théorème de Fermat, ci-après conjecture $SFLT2$: *Soit un nombre premier* $p > 3$, $K := \mathbb{Q}(\zeta)$ *le* p*-ième corps cyclotomique et* $\mathbb{Z}_K$ *son anneau d'entiers. L'équation diophantienne* $(u + v\zeta)\mathbb{Z}_K = \mathfrak{w}_1^p$*, avec* $u, v \in \mathbb{Z}\backslash\{0\}$ *premiers entre eux,* $uv \equiv 0 \mod p$ *et* $\mathfrak{w}_1$ *idéal entier de* $\mathbb{Z}_K$*, n'a pas de solution.* Supposant SFLT2 fausse pour (p, u, v), soient q un nombre premier ne divisant pas uv, n l'ordre de $\frac{v}{u} \mod q$, ξ une racine primitive n-ième de l'unité et $M := \mathbb{Q}(\xi, \zeta)$. L' objectif de ce complément de l'article [GQ] de G. Gras et R. Quême sur le même sujet est de mettre en évidence certaines propriétés fortes de décomposition des idéaux premiers $\mathfrak{Q}$ de $\mathbb{Z}_M$ au dessus de q dans certaines p-extensions de Kummer du corps M avec l'objectif d'en déduire une conjecture impliquant SFLT2 et une conjecture faible impliquant que l'équation SFLT2 peut toujours se mettre sous la forme réduite $u + \zeta v \in K^{\times p}$. [1]

1 Introduction

In all this article we denote by ζ the pth primitive root of unity defined by $\zeta := e^{\frac{2\pi i}{p}}$. In [Gr2, Conj. 1.5], G. Gras has given a conjecture which implies Fermat's Last Theorem (FLT): we recall here this conjecture which will be called *Strong Fermat's Last Theorem* (SFLT).

Conjecture 1. *Let* p *be an odd prime, set* $K = \mathbb{Q}(\zeta)$ *and* $\mathfrak{p} = (\zeta - 1)\,\mathbb{Z}[\zeta]$. *Then the equation*

$$(u + v\,\zeta)\,\mathbb{Z}[\zeta] = \mathfrak{p}^{\delta}\,\mathfrak{w}_1^p$$

in coprime integers u, v, *where* δ *is any integer* ≥ 0 *and* $\mathfrak{w}_1$ *is any integral ideal of* K, *has no solution for* $p > 3$ *except the trivial ones for which* $u + v\,\zeta = \pm 1$, $\pm\zeta$, $\pm(1 + \zeta)$, *or* $\pm(1 - \zeta)$.

The cases $uv(u+v) \not\equiv 0 \mod p$, $uv \equiv 0 \mod p$, and $u+v \equiv 0 \mod p$ are called respectively the first, second, and special case of $SFLT$.

From some works of P. Furtwängler and H.S. Vandiver, G. Gras and R. Quême [GQ] have put the basis of a new cyclotomic approach to Fermat's Last Theorem by introducing some auxiliary fields of the form $\mathbb{Q}(\mu_{q-1})$ with prime $q \neq p$ to study $SFLT$ equation and derive some consequences for FLT.

In this article, we examine some particularities of the second case of $SFLT$ (hereinafter $SFLT2$). Without loss of generality in the context of this work, we choose the following formulation of $SFLT2$ in the sequel:

Let $p > 3$ *be a prime,* $K := \mathbb{Q}(\zeta)$ *the pth cyclotomic field and* $\mathbb{Z}_K$ *its ring of integers. The diophantine equation* $(u + v\zeta)\mathbb{Z}_K = \mathfrak{w}_1^p$, *with* $u, v \in \mathbb{Z}\backslash\{0\}$ *coprime,* $v \equiv 0 \mod p$ *and* $\mathfrak{w}_1$ *ideal of* $\mathbb{Z}_K$, *has no solution.*

---

[1]

- *Keywords:* Fermat's Last Theorem, cyclotomic fields, cyclotomic units, class field theory, Vandiver's and Furtwängler's theorems
- *AMS subject classes :* 11D41, 11R18, 11R37

Thus it is always assumed in the sequel, without further mention, that $p|v$. Observe that $SFLT2$ implies the second case $FLT2$ of FLT.

1.1 General definitions and notations

At first, we fix some general notations, conventions and definitions, the context of Fermat's Last Theorem and then we explain the aims of the article.

Notations 1.
- Let $p > 3$ be a prime, $\zeta := e^{\frac{2\pi i}{p}}$, $K := \mathbb{Q}(\zeta)$ the pth cyclotomic number field, $\mathbb{Z}_K$ the ring of integers of K, and $\mathfrak{p} = (1-\zeta)\mathbb{Z}_K$ the prime ideal of $\mathbb{Z}_K$ over p.
- Let $g := \mathrm{Gal}(K/\mathbb{Q})$, for $k \not\equiv 0 \mod p$ and $s_k : \zeta \to \zeta^k$ the $p-1$ distinct elements of g.
- Let $C\ell_K$, $C\ell$, $C\ell^-$ and $C\ell_{[p]}$ be respectively the class group of K, the p-class group of K, the negative part of the p-class group of K and the p-elementary class group of K. For any ideal $\mathfrak{a}$ of K, let us note $c\ell_K(\mathfrak{a})$ and $c\ell(\mathfrak{a})$ the class of $\mathfrak{a}$ in $C\ell_K$ and $C\ell$.

Definition 1. *A number $\alpha \in K^\times$ prime to p, such that $\alpha\mathbb{Z}_K$ is the pth power of an ideal, is called a pseudo-unit. The pseudo-unit α is p-primary (i.e. the extension $K(\sqrt[p]{\alpha})/K$ is unramified at $\mathfrak{p}$) if and only if α is congruent to a p-power $\mod \mathfrak{p}^p$, see [Gr2] lem 2.1.*

If $SFLT2$ fails for (p, u, v) with $p|v$ then $\gamma := u + \zeta v \in \mathbb{Z}_K$ is a p-primary pseudo-unit of $\mathbb{Z}_K$ since $\gamma \equiv u \mod p$ (a generalization of a result of Kummer given again in [Gr2], Theo. 2.2).

We will derive from our results on $SFLT2$ some consequences for $FLT2$. We adopt in the sequel the following notations for an hypothetic counterexample to $FLT2$

$$x^p + y^p + z^p = 0,$$

$x, y, z \in \mathbb{Z}\backslash\{0\}$ coprime and $p|y$. It would be a counterexample to $SFLT2$ with $(u, v) = (x, y)$ (resp. $(u, v) = (z, y)$), verifying moreover $x + y = z_0^p$ for some $z_0|z$ (resp. $z + y = x_0^p$ for some $x_0|x$).

Notations 2. We adopt the following notations:
- For any integer $m > 0$, let $\Phi_m(X)$ be the mth cyclotomic polynomial and $\phi(m)$ the Euler indicator. For $a, b \in \mathbb{Z}\backslash\{0\}$, let us define $\Phi_m(a, b) := b^{\phi(m)}\Phi_m\left(\frac{a}{b}\right)$. Clearly $\Phi_m(a, b) \in \mathbb{Z}[a, b]$.
- Recall that we assume that $SFLT2$ fails for (p, u, v), so with u, v relatively prime and $v \equiv 0 \mod p$. Recall [GQ, Lem. 2]: *let $n \geq 1$ and q be a prime. The following properties are equivalent:*

(i) $q \not| \, n$ and $q \mid \Phi_n(u, v)$.

(ii) $q \not| \, uv$ and $\frac{v}{u}$ is of order $n \mod q$.

- Let q be a prime number dividing $\Phi_n(u, v)$ with $q \not| \, n$ and $n = dp^r$ where d is prime to p and $r \geq 0$.

$$\Phi_{dp^r}(u, v) := \prod (u\,\psi^i\,\zeta_r^j - v) \text{ for all } i \in (\mathbb{Z}/d\mathbb{Z})^\times \text{ and } j \in (\mathbb{Z}/p^r\mathbb{Z})^\times,$$

where $\psi := e^{\frac{2\pi i}{d}}$ and $\zeta_r := e^{\frac{2\pi i}{p^r}}$ (observe that the two previous definitions $\zeta := e^{\frac{2\pi i}{p}}$ and $\zeta_r := e^{\frac{2\pi i}{p^r}}$ imply that $\zeta_1 = \zeta$).

Let us fix the root of unity $\xi := \psi\,\zeta_r$. Let $L := \mathbb{Q}(\xi)$ and $M = LK = \mathbb{Q}(\xi, \zeta)$. Put $\mathfrak{q} = (q, u\,\xi - v)$ where $\mathfrak{q}$ is a prime ideal of L over q because we have assumed $q \not| \, n$. [2]

(i) If $r = 0$ then $L = \mathbb{Q}(\psi)$ and M is of degree $p-1$ over L. We denote by $\mathfrak{Q}$ any prime ideal of M above $\mathfrak{q}$ and by $\mathfrak{q}_K$ the prime ideal of K under $\mathfrak{Q}$;

(ii) If $r \geq 1$ then $M = L$ and $\mathfrak{Q} = \mathfrak{q}$.

Let us recall the definition of the pth power residue symbols in K and M with values in μ_p (see [GQ] definition 2).

Definition 2. *If $\alpha \in M$ is prime to $\mathfrak{Q} \,|\, \mathfrak{q}$ in M, then let $\bar{\alpha}$ be the image of α in the residue field $\mathbb{Z}_M/\mathfrak{Q} \simeq \mathbf{F}_{q^f}$; since $\zeta \in \mathbb{Z}_M$, the image $\bar{\zeta}$ of ζ is of order p (since $\zeta \not\equiv 1 \mod \mathfrak{Q}$) and we can put $\bar{\alpha}^{\kappa} = \bar{\zeta}^{\mu}$, $\kappa = \frac{q^f-1}{p}$, $\mu \in \mathbb{Z}/p\mathbb{Z}$, which defines the pth power residue symbol $\left(\frac{\alpha}{\mathfrak{Q}}\right)_M := \zeta^{\mu}$; this symbol is equal to 1 if and only if α is a local pth power at $\mathfrak{Q}$ (see [Gr1, I.3.2.1, Ex. 1]).*
With this definition, for any automorphism $\tau \in \mathrm{Gal}(M/\mathbb{Q})$ one obtains, from $\alpha^{\kappa} \equiv \zeta^{\mu} \mod \mathfrak{Q}$, $\tau\alpha^{\kappa} \equiv \tau\zeta^{\mu} \mod \tau\mathfrak{Q}$, thus $\tau\left(\frac{\alpha}{\mathfrak{Q}}\right)_M = \left(\frac{\tau\alpha}{\tau\mathfrak{Q}}\right)_M = \tau\zeta^{\mu}$.
If $\alpha \in K$, since $\mathfrak{q}_K \,|\, q$ in K splits totally in M/K, we have $\mathbb{Z}_K/\mathfrak{q}_K \simeq \mathbb{Z}_M/\mathfrak{Q}$ and $\left(\frac{\alpha}{\mathfrak{q}_K}\right)_K = \left(\frac{\alpha}{\mathfrak{Q}}\right)_M$ for any $\mathfrak{Q} \,|\, \mathfrak{q}_K$. In particular this implies $\left(\frac{\zeta}{\mathfrak{q}_K}\right)_K = \zeta^{\kappa}$ (the symbol of ζ does not depend on the choice of $\mathfrak{q}_K \,|\, q$).

1.2 The aim of the article

In the $FLT2$ context defined before, Furtwängler proved that, if q is a prime such that $q \mid x(x+y)$, then $q^{p-1} \equiv 1 \mod p^2$ (first Furtwängler theorem for Fermat, see Furtwängler [Fur] and Ribenboim [Rib1, 3B]), and if q is a prime such that $q \mid x - y$ then $q^{p-1} \equiv 1 \mod p^2$ (second Furtwängler theorem for Fermat, see Furtwängler [Fur] and Ribenboim [Rib1, 3C].

For a generalization of the Furtwängler results in the SFLT2 context with $q|u(u^2-v^2)$, see Gras [Gr2], Theo. 3.20 and also Gras and Quême [GQ], Cor. 2 and 3.

Definition 3. *A prime q is said p-principal if the class $c\ell_K(\mathfrak{q}_K) \in C\ell_K$ of any prime ideal $\mathfrak{q}_K$ of $\mathbb{Z}_K$ above q is the pth power of a class, which is equivalent to $\mathfrak{q}_K = \mathfrak{a}^p(\alpha)$, for an ideal $\mathfrak{a}$ of K and an $\alpha \in K^{\times}$. This contains the case where the class $c\ell_K(\mathfrak{q}_K)$ is of order coprime with p.*

We suppose that SFLT2 fails for (p, u, v). Let q be a p-principal prime with $\frac{v}{u}$ of order n mod q with $q \not| \, n$, so such that $q \mid \Phi_n(u, v)$. Renewing some ideas of Vandiver for FLT in [Va1,

---

[2] Observe that the prime ideal $\mathfrak{q}$ is fixed unambiguously by this choice of ξ.

Va2] involving the systematic use of the pth power residue symbols $\left(\frac{a}{\mathfrak{Q}}\right)_M$ for $a \in M$ coprime with $\mathfrak{Q}$ (see definition 2), the aims of this article are:

1. Exhibit some strong properties of the decomposition of the prime q in certain Kummer p-extensions of the field M involving the so-called *Vandiver cyclotomic units* and more particularly in detailing the case of the primes q dividing $u^{2p} - v^{2p}$.
2. Set a conjecture in contradiction with this decomposition for some *arbitrarily large* primes q implying the SFLT2 conjecture.
3. Set a weak conjecture in contradiction with this decomposition for some *small* primes q implying that the SFLT2 equation could be reduced to the form

   $$u + \zeta v \in K^{\times p}.$$

   This reduced form seems possibly easier to search for a proof of SFLT2 conjecture with a diophantine approach.
4. Set a weak conjecture in contradiction with such decompositions of these primes q implying the generalization to the second case FLT2 of the Terjanian FLT1 theorem [Ter] (i.e. $x^{2p} + y^{2p} + z^{2p} = 0$ has no solution if $xyz \not\equiv 0 \mod p$).

2 The main theorem

We give at first a definition and an elementary lemma independent of the SFLT conjecture.

Definition 4. *Let $n = dp^r$, with d, p coprime and $r \geq 0$. Let ξ be a fixed primitive nth root of unity $\xi = \psi\zeta_r$ where $\psi := e^{\frac{2\pi i}{d}}$ and $\zeta_r := e^{\frac{2\pi i}{p^r}}$.*

For all $0 \leq k < p-1$, let us define[3]

$$\varepsilon_k := 1 + \xi\zeta^k.^4$$

Lemma 2.1.

a) If $k = 0$, $\varepsilon_0 = 1 + \xi$ is a cyclotomic unit of L except if $d = 1$ ($\varepsilon_0 = 2$) or $d = 2$ ($\varepsilon_0 = 0$).

b) Suppose that $0 < k < p-1$.

(i) If $d > 2$ then $\varepsilon_k = 1 + \xi\zeta^k$ is a cyclotomic unit.

(ii) If $d = 2$ then ε_k is not a cyclotomic unit and

– If $r \geq 1$ then $\varepsilon_k = 1 - \zeta_r^{1+kp^{r-1}} \in \mathbb{Z}[\zeta_r]$ with $\varepsilon_k\mathbb{Z}[\zeta_r] = \mathfrak{p}_r$ where $\mathfrak{p}_r$ is the prime ideal of $\mathbb{Z}[\zeta_r]$ above p.

---

[3] The reason why $k = p-1$ is discarded will be explained in remark 1 after the lemma 2.2.

[4] ε_k is used with this meaning in the sequel of the article.

- *If* $r = 0$ *then* $\varepsilon_k = 1 - \zeta^k$ *with* $\varepsilon_k \mathbb{Z}_K = \mathfrak{p}$.

(iii) If $d = 1$ *then* ε_k *is a cyclotomic unit and*

- *If* $r \geq 1$ *then* $\varepsilon_k = 1 + \zeta_r^{1+kp^{r-1}}$.
- *If* $r = 0$ *then* $\varepsilon_k = 1 + \zeta^k$.

Proof. Left to the reader. $\square$

The following lemma using Hilbert class field theory for K plays a central role in the article.

Lemma 2.2. *Suppose that* $SFLT2$ *fails for* (p, u, v) *with* $p|v$. *Let* $q \not| puv$ *be a* p*-principal prime,* n *the order of* $\frac{v}{u} \mod q$, $\xi := e^{\frac{2\pi i}{n}}$ *and* $\mathfrak{q}$ *be the prime ideal* $\mathfrak{q} := (u\xi - v, q)$ *of* $\mathbb{Z}_L$. *Then*

$$\left(\frac{\varepsilon_k}{\mathfrak{Q}}\right)_M = \left(\frac{u}{\mathfrak{q}_K}\right)_K^{-1} \text{ for all } k = 1, \ldots, p-2 \text{ and all } \mathfrak{Q}|\mathfrak{q},^{5}$$

where $\varepsilon_k = 1 + \xi\zeta^k$.

Proof.

-We have $u\xi - v \equiv 0 \mod \mathfrak{q}$, so $u\xi - v \equiv 0 \mod \mathfrak{Q}$ for all $\mathfrak{Q}|\mathfrak{q}$, hence with $\gamma := u + \zeta v$, we get $s_k(\gamma) = u + \zeta^k v \equiv u(1 + \xi\zeta^k) \equiv u\varepsilon_k \mod \mathfrak{Q}$, for all $k \not\equiv 0 \mod p$.

- We obtain $\left(\frac{s_k(\gamma)}{\mathfrak{Q}}\right)_M = \left(\frac{u}{\mathfrak{Q}}\right)_M \left(\frac{\varepsilon_k}{\mathfrak{Q}}\right)_M$, so $\left(\frac{s_k(\gamma)}{\mathfrak{q}_K}\right)_K = \left(\frac{u}{\mathfrak{q}_K}\right)_K \left(\frac{\varepsilon_k}{\mathfrak{Q}}\right)_M$.

- The numbers $s_k(\gamma)$ are p-primary pseudo-units, which implies $\left(\frac{s_k(\gamma)}{\mathfrak{q}_K}\right)_K = 1$ for all $k \not\equiv 0 \mod p$ from the Hilbert class field decomposition theorem because, by assumption, q is p-principal. $\square$

Remark 1. We explain why we can discard the value $k = p - 1$ of the index k. We exclude the value $k = p - 1$, because ε_k would be null if and only if $d = 2, r = 1$ and $k = p - 1$. For all the other (d, r, k), $1 \leq k \leq p - 1$ with $\varepsilon_k \neq 0$, we will show that it is always possible to express $\left(\frac{1+\xi\zeta^{p-1}}{\mathfrak{Q}}\right)_M$ in function of $\left(\frac{1+\xi\zeta^k}{\mathfrak{Q}}\right)_M$, $k = 1, \ldots, p-2$ as follows: we start from

$$u(1 + \xi\zeta^j) \equiv s_j(\gamma) \mod \mathfrak{q}, \text{ for } j = 1, \ldots, p-1,$$

where $1 + \xi\zeta^j$ is always nonzero, therefore

$$u^{p-1} \prod_{j=1}^{p-1} (1 + \xi\zeta^j) \equiv N_{K/\mathbb{Q}}(\gamma) = w_1^p \mod \mathfrak{q},$$

---

[5] Observe that $\left(\frac{u}{\mathfrak{q}_K}\right)_K^{-1}$ does not depend on k and recall that $\mathfrak{Q} = \mathfrak{q}$ if $r > 0$.

so

$$\Big(\frac{u^{p-1}(1+\xi\zeta)\dots(1+\xi\zeta^{p-2})(1+\xi\zeta^{p-1})}{\mathfrak{Q}}\Big)_M = 1 \ \text{ for all } \mathfrak{Q}|\mathfrak{q}$$

so, from lemma 2.2 applied for all $1 \leq k \leq p-2$ we get $\Big(\frac{u(1+\xi\zeta^{p-1})}{\mathfrak{Q}}\Big)_M = 1$, and thus

$$\Big(\frac{1+\xi\zeta^{p-1}}{\mathfrak{Q}}\Big)_M = \Big(\frac{1+\xi\zeta^{k}}{\mathfrak{Q}}\Big)_M, \ \text{ for all } k = 1,\dots,p-2.$$

Remark 2. Suppose moreover that $FLT2$ fails for (p,x,y,z). In that case, we have (with x, y in place of u, v) the relations $(x+\zeta y)\mathbb{Z}_K = \mathfrak{z}_1^p$ where $\mathfrak{z}_1$ is an ideal of $\mathbb{Z}_K$, $x+y = z_0^p$ and $\frac{x^p+y^p}{x+y} = z_1^p$ with $z = -z_0 z_1$. We get $x\xi - y \equiv 0 \mod \mathfrak{q}$, so $x(1+\xi) \equiv z_0^p \mod \mathfrak{q}$, thus $\Big(\frac{x}{\mathfrak{q}_K}\Big)_K \Big(\frac{1+\xi}{\mathfrak{Q}}\Big)_M = 1$.

From $x^p + y^p + z^p = 0$, we get $x^p(1+\xi^p) \equiv -z^p \mod \mathfrak{q}$, so $\Big(\frac{1+\xi^p}{\mathfrak{Q}}\Big)_M = 1$ and thus we improve slightly the lemma 2.2 if $FLT2$ fails for (p,x,y,z):

Corollary 2.3. *Suppose that $FLT2$ fails for (p,x,y,z). Let $q \not| \, pxy$ be a p-principal prime with $\frac{x}{y}$ of order $n \mod q$. Then*

$$\Big(\frac{1+\xi^p}{\mathfrak{Q}}\Big)_M = 1$$

and

$$\Big(\frac{\varepsilon_k}{\mathfrak{Q}}\Big)_M = \Big(\frac{x}{\mathfrak{q}_K}\Big)_K^{-1} \ \textit{for all } k = 0,1,\dots,p-2 \textit{ and all } \mathfrak{Q}|\mathfrak{q}.$$

2.1 The general case

We give the main theorem characterizing the decomposition of $\mathfrak{Q}$ in a Kummer p-extension of M defined from the Vandiver's cyclotomic units.

Theorem 2.4. *Suppose that $SFLT2$ fails for (p,u,v), $p \geq 3$ with $p|v$. Let $q \not| \, puv$ be a p-principal prime, n the order of $\frac{v}{u} \mod q$ and $\xi := e^{\frac{2\pi i}{n}}$. For all $0 \leq k < p-1$, let $\varepsilon_k := 1+\xi\zeta^k$ and the prime ideal $\mathfrak{q} := (q, u\,\xi - v)$ of $\mathbb{Z}[\xi]$ above q.*

Then all the prime ideals $\mathfrak{Q}$ of $\mathbb{Z}[\xi,\zeta]$ dividing $\mathfrak{q}$ totally split in the Kummer extension

$$M\big(\sqrt[p]{<\varepsilon_k\varepsilon_1^{-1}>_{k=1,\dots,p-2}}\big)/M.$$

Proof. It is a reformulation of the previous lemma 2.2 which had shown that $\Big(\frac{\varepsilon_k}{\mathfrak{Q}}\Big)_M = \Big(\frac{\varepsilon_1}{\mathfrak{Q}}\Big)_M$, for $k = 1,\dots,p-2$. □

Remark 3.

1. Observe from lemma 2.1 that if $d > 2$ then ε_{p-1} is a cyclotomic unit. If $p = 3$ then the SFLT2 equation has actually infinitely many solutions with $p|v$ of form $u + jv = (s + jt)^3$, with $s, t \in \mathbb{Z}$ coprime and $s+t \not\equiv 0 \mod 3$, see[GQ] remark 2.3. Let $q > 3$ be a prime. For any s, t given, we get $u = s^3+t^3-3st^2, v = 3s^2t-3st^2$ and the order $n = d\cdot 3^r$ of $\frac{v}{u} \mod q$. If $d > 2$ then $(1 + \xi j)(1 + \xi j^2) \neq 0$ and the application of theorem 2.4 gives $\left(\frac{(1+\xi j^2)(1+\xi j)^{-1}}{\mathfrak{Q}}\right)_M = 1$. We can verify it directly because that case corresponds to $u + vj = (s + jt)^3$.
2. If $SFLT2$ fails for (p, u, v) with $p > 3$ *large* and $p|v$, and if the p-principal prime $q \ll p$ (*very small* compare to p) , the probability is very small that the ideal $\mathfrak{q}$ of L over q split totally in the Kummer extension $M\big(\sqrt[p]{<\varepsilon_k\varepsilon_1^{-1}>_{k=1,\dots,p-2}}\big)/M$: let p^δ be the degree of this Kummer extension; the probability estimate that $\mathfrak{q}$ split totally in this extension should be roughly $\mathcal{P} < \mathcal{O}(\frac{\phi(q)}{p^\delta})$.
3. As a consequence, if $SFLT2$ fails for (p, u, v) with $p|v$ sufficiently large, then these probability estimates suggest that the integer $|v|$ should be an *"apocalyptically" large integer* with a very large number of p-principal primes $q|v$ with $\kappa \not\equiv 0 \mod p$, which could bring some tools for another diophantine tackling of SFLT2 problem.

At this stage it is possible to formulate the following conjecture:

Conjecture 2. *If, for all triples $(p, u, v) \in \mathbb{Z}^3$ with $p > 3$ prime, with u, v coprime and $p|v$, there exists at least one p-principal prime q with $puv \not\equiv 0 \mod q$, such that the prime ideal $\mathfrak{q} = (q, u\xi - v)$ is not totally split in the extension $M\big(\sqrt[p]{<\varepsilon_k\varepsilon_1^{-1}>_{k=1,\dots,p-2}}\big)/M$, with n order of $\frac{v}{u} \mod q$ and $\xi = e^{\frac{2\pi i}{n}}$, then $SFLT2$ holds.* [6]

Remark 4.

1. Note that the formulation of this conjecture set for all pairs (u, v) coprime with $p|v$ does not assume that $u+\zeta v$ is a pseudo-unit (or not), and thus is independent of the SFLT problem. In this conjecture the assumption $puv \not\equiv 0 \mod q$ can require that q be taken arbitrarily large, so with $q \gg p$ (very large compare to p). For a more general conjecture of similar nature implying SFLT (first, second and special case), see [GQ] conjecture 3.
2. In subsection 2.3, we will show the existence of *effective small* non p-principal primes q compare to p ($q \ll p$) with $uv \not\equiv 0 \mod p$ that allows to reduce the $SFLT2$ equation to the weaker form of diophantine equation (possibly easier to tackle)

$$u + \zeta v \in K^{\times p}.$$

---

[6] Note that we use this formulation, abuse of language for: *all the prime ideals $\mathfrak{Q}$ of M over $\mathfrak{q}$ are not totally split in the extension* $M\big(\sqrt[p]{<\varepsilon_k\varepsilon_1^{-1}>_{k=1,\dots,p-2}}\big)/M$. This remark concerns also several statements of conjectures or theorems in the sequel.

2.2 The case $n \in \{p, 1, 2p, 2\}$

Recall that we have assumed $p > 3$. In this subsection, we suppose that $SFLT2$ fails for (p, u, v) and we apply the lemma 2.2 in fixing $n \in \{p, 1, 2p, 2\}$ to derive some strong properties of all the p-principal primes q dividing $\Phi_n(u, v)$ for these values of n. Observe that we have $M = K$ in all these cases.

2.2.1 The two cases $n = p$ and $n = 1$.

The reunion of these two cases allows us to investigate the properties of all the p-principal primes q dividing $u^p - v^p$.

Corollary 2.5. *Case $n = p$: suppose that $SFLT2$ fails for (p, u, v). If q is a p-principal prime dividing $\frac{u^p - v^p}{u - v}$ then*

$$\begin{aligned} &q \equiv 1 \mod p^2, \\ &(1+\zeta)^{(q-1)/p} \equiv u^{(q-1)/p} \equiv v^{(q-1)/p} \equiv 2^{(q-1)/p} \equiv 1 \mod q, \end{aligned}$$

and the prime ideal $\mathfrak{q}_K := (q, u\zeta - v)$ splits totally in the extension

$$K\big(\sqrt[p]{< 1+\zeta^j >_{j=0,1,\dots,p-2}}\big)/K.$$

Proof. Here $\xi = \zeta$, $u\zeta - v \equiv 0 \mod \mathfrak{q}$, $\varepsilon_k = 1 + \zeta^{k+1}$, $M = L = K$ and $\mathfrak{q} = \mathfrak{Q} = \mathfrak{q}_K$, so $\Big(\frac{1+\zeta^{k+1}}{\mathfrak{q}_K}\Big)_K = \Big(\frac{u}{\mathfrak{q}_K}\Big)_K^{-1}$ for all $k = 1, \dots, p-2$. It follows that $\Big(\frac{1+\zeta^2}{\mathfrak{q}_K}\Big)_K = \Big(\frac{1+\zeta^{-2}}{\mathfrak{q}_K}\Big)_K$, which implies that $\Big(\frac{\zeta}{\mathfrak{q}_K}\Big)_K = 1$, thus $q \equiv 1 \mod p^2$, observing that $q \equiv 1 \mod p$.

From $\Big(\frac{\zeta}{\mathfrak{q}_K}\Big)_K = 1$, we get $\Big(\frac{1+\zeta}{\mathfrak{q}_K}\Big)_K = \Big(\frac{1+\zeta^{p-1}}{\mathfrak{q}_K}\Big)_K$, so $\Big(\frac{1+\zeta^j}{\mathfrak{q}_K}\Big)_K = \Big(\frac{u}{\mathfrak{q}_K}\Big)_K^{-1}$, for all $j = 1, \dots, p-1$. Thus $\Big(\frac{1+\zeta}{\mathfrak{q}_K}\Big)_K = \dots = \Big(\frac{1+\zeta^{p-1}}{\mathfrak{q}_K}\Big)_K$. Therefore $\Big(\frac{N_{K/\mathbb{Q}}(1+\zeta)}{\mathfrak{q}_K}\Big) = \Big(\Big(\frac{u^{-1}}{\mathfrak{q}_K}\Big)_K^{p-1}\Big) = 1$, so $\Big(\frac{u}{\mathfrak{q}_K}\Big)_K = \Big(\frac{v}{\mathfrak{q}_K}\Big)_K = 1$, and gathering these results we get

$$\Big(\frac{1+\zeta}{\mathfrak{q}_K}\Big)_K = \dots = \Big(\frac{1+\zeta^{p-1}}{\mathfrak{q}_K}\Big)_K = \Big(\frac{u}{\mathfrak{q}_K}\Big)_K = \Big(\frac{v}{\mathfrak{q}_K}\Big)_K = 1.$$

From $u\zeta - v \equiv 0 \mod \mathfrak{q}_K$, we have $w_1^p = \frac{u^p + v^p}{u + v} \equiv \frac{2u^p}{u(1+\zeta)} \mod \mathfrak{q}_K$, so $\Big(\frac{2}{\mathfrak{q}_K}\Big)_K = 1$, and finally

$$\Big(\frac{2}{\mathfrak{q}_K}\Big)_K = \Big(\frac{1+\zeta}{\mathfrak{q}_K}\Big)_K = \dots = \Big(\frac{1+\zeta^{p-1}}{\mathfrak{q}_K}\Big)_K = \Big(\frac{v}{\mathfrak{q}_K}\Big)_K = \Big(\frac{u}{\mathfrak{q}_K}\Big)_K = 1.$$

By conjugation by s_ℓ, we get $\left(\frac{1+\zeta}{s_\ell(\mathfrak{q}_K)}\right)_K = 1$ for any $\ell \not\equiv 0 \mod p$, thus

$$(1+\zeta)^{(q-1)/p} \equiv 1 \mod q,$$

and finally q splits totally in the extension $K\left(\sqrt[p]{<1+\zeta^j>_{j=0,1,\dots,p-1}}\right)/K$. $\square$

Remark 5. See theorem 3.4 for a strong generalization of this result *without assumption* that q is a p-principal prime when FLT2 fails for (p, x, y, z) with $(u, v) = (x, y)$.

Corollary 2.6. *Case $n = 1$: suppose that $SFLT2$ fails for (p, u, v). If q is a p-principal prime of order $f \mod p$, q divides $u - v$ and $\mathfrak{q}_K$ is any prime ideal of $\mathbb{Z}_K$ over q then we have:*

$$\begin{aligned}
&q^f \equiv 1 \mod p^2,\\
&u^{(q^f-1)/p} \equiv v^{(q^f-1)/p} \equiv (1+\zeta)^{(q^f-1)/p} \equiv 2^{(q^f-1)/p} \equiv 1 \mod q.
\end{aligned}$$

and $\mathfrak{q}_K$ splits totally in the extension $K\left(\sqrt[p]{<1+\zeta^j>_{j=0,1,\dots,p-1}}\right)/K$.

Proof. Here $\varepsilon_k = 1+\zeta^k$, $M = K$ and $L = \mathbb{Q}$. The proof is very similar to the case $n = p$ corollary 2.5 starting here from the relation

$$u + \zeta^j v \equiv u(1+\zeta^j) \mod q,$$

for all $j \not\equiv 0 \mod p$ (instead of a congruence $\mod \mathfrak{q}_K$), observing that the degree of $q \mod p$ can be here greater than 1. We have $N_{K/\mathbb{Q}}(1+\zeta) = 1$ which implies that $\left(\frac{u}{\mathfrak{q}_K}\right)_K = 1$ and then $\frac{u^p+v^p}{u+v} = w_1^p \equiv \frac{2^p u^p}{2u} \mod q$ implies $\left(\frac{2}{\mathfrak{q}_K}\right)_K = 1$. $\square$

Observe that if $u = x, v = y$ corresponds to a solution of the Fermat's equation $x^p + y^p + z^p = 0$, $p = y$, from Barlow-Abel relations we get $z+y = x_0^p$, $x+z = p^{\nu p-1}y_0^p$ and so $x-y = p^{\nu p-1}y_0^p - x_0^p$ which improves the previous corollary with $\left(\frac{p}{\mathfrak{q}_K}\right)_K = 1$ for the primes $q|x-y$.

Remark 6. The application of corollaries 2.5 and 2.6 implies that all the p-principal primes q dividing $u^p - v^p$ verify $q^f \equiv 1 \mod p^2$, which brings a new generalization of the second Furtwängler theorem in the $SFLT2$ context obtained for the primes q dividing $u - v$ in [GQ] cor. 3.

2.2.2 The cases $n = 2p$, $p > 3$, and $n = 2$

The reunion of these two corollaries of the theorem 2.4 allows us to investigate all the p-principal primes q dividing $u^p + v^p$ at the *core* of the $SFLT2$ equation. We need to modify slightly the method to take into account the only values k with $\mathfrak{q}_K$ co-prime with $u + \zeta^k v$.

Corollary 2.7. *Case $n = 2p$: suppose that $SFLT2$ fails for (p, u, v). If q is a p-principal prime dividing $\frac{u^p+v^p}{u+v}$ and $\mathfrak{q}_K$ is the prime ideal $\mathfrak{q}_K := (q, u\zeta + v)$ of $\mathbb{Z}_K$, then*

$$q \equiv 1 \mod p^2,$$
$$\Big(\frac{u}{\mathfrak{q}_K}\Big)_K = \Big(\frac{v}{\mathfrak{q}_K}\Big)_K = \Big(\frac{p}{\mathfrak{q}_K}\Big)_K = \Big(\frac{1-\zeta^j}{\mathfrak{q}_K}\Big)_K^{-1}, \quad \textit{for } j \not\equiv 0 \mod p,$$

and $\mathfrak{q}_K$ splits totally in $K\big(\sqrt[p]{< (1-\zeta^j)/(1-\zeta) >_{j\not\equiv 0 \mod p}}\big)/K$.

Proof. Here, we have $M = K = L$ and $\xi = -\zeta$ which implies that $v \equiv -\zeta u \mod \mathfrak{q}$, thus

$$s_k(u + \zeta v) = u + \zeta^k v = s_k(\gamma) \equiv u(1 - \zeta^{k+1}) \mod \mathfrak{q}, \ \ k = 1, \dots p - 2.$$

We obtain $\Big(\frac{u}{\mathfrak{q}_K}\Big)_K\Big(\frac{1-\zeta^{k+1}}{\mathfrak{q}_K}\Big)_K = 1$, for $k \not\equiv p-1 \mod p$, therefore $\Big(\frac{1-\zeta^2}{\mathfrak{q}_K}\Big)_K = \Big(\frac{1-\zeta^{p-2}}{\mathfrak{q}_K}\Big)_K$, so $\Big(\frac{\zeta}{\mathfrak{q}_K}\Big)_K = 1$ and $q \equiv 1 \mod p^2$ which implies that $\Big(\frac{1-\zeta}{\mathfrak{q}_K}\Big)_K = \Big(\frac{1-\zeta^{p-1}}{\mathfrak{q}_K}\Big)_K$. Gathering these results, we get

$$\Big(\frac{1-\zeta}{\mathfrak{q}_K}\Big)_K = \dots = \Big(\frac{1-\zeta^{p-1}}{\mathfrak{q}_K}\Big)_K,$$

by multiplication we get $\Big(\frac{u^{p-1}}{\mathfrak{q}_K}\Big)_K\Big(\frac{p}{\mathfrak{q}_K}\Big)_K = 1$ and finally:

$$\Big(\frac{u}{\mathfrak{q}_K}\Big)_K = \Big(\frac{v}{\mathfrak{q}_K}\Big)_K = \Big(\frac{p}{\mathfrak{q}_K}\Big)_K = \Big(\frac{1-\zeta^j}{\mathfrak{q}_K}\Big)_K^{-1}, \quad \text{for all } j \not\equiv 0 \mod p.$$

which achieves the proof. □

Remark 7. Suppose moreover that $FLT2$ fails for (p, x, y, z) with $p|y$. Then, applying corollary 2.7 with $(u, v) = (x, y)$, we get

$$\Big(\frac{1-\zeta}{\mathfrak{q}_K}\Big)_K^{-1} = \Big(\frac{p}{\mathfrak{q}_K}\Big)_K. \tag{1}$$

Moreover $x + y = z_0^p$, so $x + y \equiv x(1-\zeta) \equiv z_0^p \mod \mathfrak{q}_K$. In an other hand, $\mathfrak{q}_K|z$, so $x(1-\zeta) \equiv (x+z)(1-\zeta) = p^{p\nu-1}y_1^p(1-\zeta) \equiv z_0^p \mod \mathfrak{q}_K$ with $\nu \geq 1$, so $\Big(\frac{1-\zeta}{\mathfrak{q}_K}\Big)_K = \Big(\frac{p}{\mathfrak{q}_K}\Big)_K$, so, from (1), $\Big(\frac{p}{\mathfrak{q}_K}\Big)_K = 1$. We have proved:[7]

---

[7] Observe that this result $\big(\frac{p}{\mathfrak{q}_K}\big)_K = 1$ depending only on p and q completes strongly the relation $q \equiv 1 \mod p^2$ between p and q.

Corollary 2.8. *Suppose that $FLT2$ fails for (p,x,y,z) with $p \mid y$. If q is a p-principal prime dividing $\frac{x^p+y^p}{x+y}$ and $\mathfrak{q}_K$ is the prime $\mathfrak{q}_K := (q, x\zeta+y)$ then*

$$\begin{aligned}&q \equiv 1 \mod p^2,\\ &\Big(\frac{x}{\mathfrak{q}_K}\Big)_K = \Big(\frac{y}{\mathfrak{q}_K}\Big)_K = \Big(\frac{p}{\mathfrak{q}_K}\Big)_K = \Big(\frac{1-\zeta^j}{\mathfrak{q}_K}\Big)_K = 1,\ j=1,\dots,p-1,\end{aligned}$$

and $\mathfrak{q}_K$ splits totally in the extension $K\big(\sqrt[p]{< 1-\zeta^j >_{j\not\equiv 0 \mod p}}\big)/K$.

Remark 8. See theorem 3.7 for a generalization of this result without assumption that q is a p-principal ideal when $\Big(\frac{p}{\mathfrak{q}_K}\Big)_K = 1$.

Corollary 2.9. *Case $n=2$: suppose that $SFLT2$ fails for (p,u,v). If q is a p-principal prime dividing $u+v$ of degree $f \mod p$ and $\mathfrak{q}_K$ is any prime ideal of $\mathbb{Z}_K$ over q then*

$$\begin{aligned}&q^f \equiv 1 \mod p^2,\\ &\Big(\frac{u}{\mathfrak{q}_K}\Big)_K = \Big(\frac{v}{\mathfrak{q}_K}\Big)_K = \Big(\frac{p}{\mathfrak{q}_K}\Big)_K = \Big(\frac{1-\zeta^j}{\mathfrak{q}_K}\Big)_K^{-1} \text{ for all } j \not\equiv 0 \mod p.\end{aligned}$$

and $\mathfrak{q}_K$ splits totally in $K\big(\sqrt[p]{< (1-\zeta^j)/(1-\zeta) >_{j\not\equiv 0 \mod p}}\big)/K$.

Proof. Here, $\varepsilon_j = 1-\zeta^j$ for $j \not\equiv 0 \mod p$, $M = K$ and $L = \mathbb{Q}$. In that case, we get $\Big(\frac{u}{\mathfrak{q}_K}\Big)_K \Big(\frac{1-\zeta^j}{\mathfrak{q}_K}\Big)_K = 1$ for all $j \not\equiv 0 \mod p$. The end of the proof is similar to that of corollary 2.7. □

Observe that if $FLT2$ fails for p and $q|x+y$ (case $n=2$) we get $\Big(\frac{p}{\mathfrak{q}_K}\Big)_K = 1$ for the same reason than the case $q|x-y$ ($n=1$).

Remark 9. The application of corollaries 2.7 and 2.9 implies that all the p-principal primes q dividing u^p+v^p verify $q^f \equiv 1 \mod p^2$, which brings a new generalization of the first Furtwängler theorem in the $SFLT2$ context obtained for the primes q dividing $u+v$ in [GQ] cor. 2.

2.3 The case of non p-principal primes q

Assume that $SFLT2$ fails for (p,u,v) with $p|v$. In this subsection, we will set a weak conjecture (so with a proof we can hope easier) implying that $SFLT2$ equation could always be reduced in the form

$$u + \zeta v \in K^{\times p},$$

as soon as p is irregular, which is assumed in this subsection. Let $q \neq p$ be a prime number and $\mathfrak{q}_K$ any prime ideal of $\mathbb{Z}_K$ above q.

Lemma 2.10. *If q divides u (resp v) then $\left(\frac{v}{\mathfrak{q}_K}\right)_K = 1$ (resp. $\left(\frac{u}{\mathfrak{q}_K}\right)_K = 1$).*

Proof. We have $N_{K/\mathbb{Q}}(u + v\zeta) = \frac{u^p+v^p}{u+v} = w_1^p$, where $N_{K/\mathbb{Q}}(\mathfrak{w}_1) = w_1$; so $q|v$ implies that $u^{p-1} \equiv w_1^p \pmod{q}$ which leads to $\left(\frac{u}{\mathfrak{q}_K}\right)_K = 1$. Similar proof starting from $q|u$. ☐

Let $\mathcal{S}$ be the finite set of smallest non p-principal primes q such that the set of p-classes $c\ell(\mathfrak{q}_K) \in C\ell$ of the prime ideals $\mathfrak{q}_K$ of K over q generates the p-elementary p-class group $C\ell[p]$ of K. Let us note Q_p the greatest prime $q \in \mathcal{S}$. Let the Minkowski Bound of K given by

$$\mathcal{B}_p := (\frac{4}{\pi})^{(p-1)/2}\frac{(p-1)!}{(p-1)^{p-1}}\sqrt{p^{p-2}}.$$

With these definitions we get $Q_p \leq \mathcal{B}_p$.

Observe that under the General Riemann Hypothesis GRH, we know that the whole ideal class group of K is generated by the set of prime ideals $\mathfrak{l}$ with

$$N_{K/\mathbb{Q}}(\mathfrak{l}) < B := 12(\log\,\Delta_K)^2, \tag{2}$$

where Δ_K is the absolute discriminant of K (see [BDF]). Under GRH, we have generally $Q_p \lll \mathcal{B}_p$ (where $\lll$ means *very small compare to*) as soon as p is large.

Lemma 2.11. *Suppose that $u + \zeta v \notin K^{\times p}$. Then there exists at least one prime $q \in \mathcal{S}$ such that $uv \not\equiv 0 \pmod{q}$.*

Proof. Let γ be a pth root of $u + \zeta v$, $\gamma := \sqrt[p]{u + \zeta v}$. Let H_1 be the p-elementary Hilbert class field of K (so that $\mathrm{Gal}(H_1/K) \simeq C\ell_{[p]}$). Let N_1 be a subextension of H_1 such that H_1 is the direct compositum of N_1 and $K(\sqrt[p]{\gamma})$ over K.

Therefore there exists at least one prime $q \in \mathcal{S}$ such that the Frobenius of all the prime ideals $\mathfrak{q}_K$ over q in H_1/K are of order p and fix N_1, so that their restriction to $K(\sqrt[p]{\gamma})/K$ are of order p. Thus $\left(\frac{u+\zeta v}{\mathfrak{q}_K}\right)_K \neq 1$.

(i) If $q|v$, we get a contradiction with lemma 2.10, so $v \not\equiv 0 \mod q$.

(ii) If $q|u$ we have $\left(\frac{u+\zeta v}{\mathfrak{q}_K}\right)_K = \left(\frac{\zeta v}{\mathfrak{q}_K}\right)_K = \left(\frac{\zeta}{\mathfrak{q}_K}\right)_K$ because $\left(\frac{v}{\mathfrak{q}_K}\right)_K = 1$ from Lemma 2.10 and thus $\left(\frac{u+\zeta v}{\mathfrak{q}_K}\right)_K = 1$ since $\kappa \equiv 0 \pmod{p}$ from the first Furtwangler's theorem for SFLT (see [GQ, Corollary 2.10]), giving also a contradiction with $\left(\frac{u+\zeta v}{\mathfrak{q}_K}\right)_K \neq 1$.Therefore $u \not\equiv 0 \pmod{q}$. ☐

Definition 5. For a definition of the character of Teichmüller ω of $Gal(K/\mathbb{Q})$ see [GQ] section 1.3. Let us consider the characters $\chi_i = \omega^i$, $1 \leq i \leq p-1$. Let $\mathcal{E}$ be the group of p-primary pseudo-units of K seen as a $\mathbb{F}_p[g]$-module, and the χ_i-components $\mathcal{E}_i := \mathcal{E}^{e_{\chi_i}}$ of $\mathcal{E}$ interpreted in the group $\mathcal{E}/\mathcal{E}^p$. The components $\mathcal{E}_i$ are not all trivial because p is irregular.

Theorem 2.12. *Suppose that SFLT2 fails for* (p, u, v) *with* $u + \zeta v \notin K^{\times p}$*. Then* p *is irregular and there exists at least one non* p*-principal prime* $q \in \mathcal{S}$ *such that:*

1. $q \not| uv$
2. *Let* n *be the order of* $\frac{v}{u} \mod q$*,* $\xi := e^{\frac{2\pi i}{n}}$ *and* $\mathfrak{q} := (u\xi - v, q)$ *prime ideal of* $\mathbb{Z}[\xi]$ *above* q*. There exists at least one integer* $m \not\equiv 0 \mod p$ *such that all the prime ideals* $\mathfrak{Q}$ *of* $\mathbb{Z}[\xi, \zeta]$ *dividing* $\mathfrak{q}$ *split totally in the Kummer extension*

$$M(\sqrt[p]{<((1+\xi\zeta^k)\zeta^{-k^m})/((1+\xi\zeta)\zeta^{-1}) >_{k=1,\dots,p-2}})/M.$$

Proof.

1. p is irregular from [Gr2] thm 2.2. From lemma 2.11 it is possible to choose $q \in \mathcal{S}$ with $uv \not\equiv 0 \mod p$.
2. The pseudo-unit $\gamma = \sqrt[p]{u + \zeta v}$ is not a pth power, hence in the decomposition $\gamma = \prod_{\chi_i} \gamma^{e_{\chi_i}}$ on the p-1 characters $\chi_i,\ i = 1, \dots, p-1$, there exists at least one $i = m$ such that the pseudo-unit $\gamma^{e_{\chi_m}}$ be not a p-power. Let us name it γ_m.

   γ_m is a p-primary pseudo-unit; from Hilbert's class field theory, decomposition and reflection theorems and lemma 2.11 applied with H_1 and γ_m, it is possible to choose one $\mathfrak{q}_K \in \mathcal{S}$ such that

$$\left(\frac{\gamma_m}{\mathfrak{q}_K}\right)_K = \zeta^{w_m} \text{ with } w_m \not\equiv 0 \mod p \text{ and } \left(\frac{\gamma_i}{\mathfrak{q}_K}\right)_K = 1 \text{ for all } i \neq m.$$

3. Here the extension $M(\sqrt[p]{\gamma_m})$ is Galois on $\mathbb{Q}$ because its Galois group acts in letting globally unvarying the radical, when raising to a power prime to p by use of the idempotent. We can always change $\mathfrak{q}_K$ in acting by conjugation to obtain $w_m = 1$ and so

$$\left(\frac{\gamma}{\mathfrak{q}_K}\right)_K = \left(\frac{\gamma_m}{\mathfrak{q}_K}\right)_K = \zeta.$$

4. From $s_k(\gamma) = u + \zeta^k v$ for $k = 1, \dots, p-1$ and $u\xi - v \equiv 0 \mod \mathfrak{q}$ we get

$$s_k(\gamma) \equiv u\varepsilon_k \mod \mathfrak{q},$$

   so

$$\left(\frac{s_k(\gamma)}{\mathfrak{q}_K}\right)_K = \left(\frac{u\varepsilon_k}{\mathfrak{Q}}\right)_M = \left(\frac{s_k(\gamma_m)}{\mathfrak{q}_K}\right)_K = \zeta^{k^m},$$

   so

$$\left(\frac{u(1+\xi\zeta^k)}{\mathfrak{Q}}\right)_M = \zeta^{k^m},$$

   and also

$$\left(\frac{u(1+\xi\zeta)}{\mathfrak{Q}}\right)_M = \zeta,$$

   which leads to the result.

□

This theorem leads us to set the following *criterion* [8] for the SFLT2 equation to take the reduced form $u+\zeta v\in K^{\times p}$ for the irregular prime $p>3$:

Corollary 2.13. *Let $p>3$ be an odd irregular prime. Assume that SFLT2 fails for p and that for all the primes $q\in\mathcal{S}$ and all the integers $n>2$ dividing $q-1$, there is no prime ideal $\mathfrak{q}$ of $\mathbb{Z}[\xi]$ above q which splits totally in the Kummer extension*

$$\mathbb{Q}(\xi,\zeta)\big(\sqrt[p]{<((1+\xi\zeta^k)\zeta^{-km})/((1+\xi\zeta)\zeta^{-})>_{k=1,\dots,p-2}}\big)/\mathbb{Q}(\xi,\zeta)$$

with $\xi:=e^{\frac{2\pi i}{n}}$, and m an integer $\not\equiv 0 \mod p$. Then the solution(s) of the $SFLT2$ equation take(s) the reduced form $u+\zeta v\in K^{\times p}$.

We conjecture that the the corollary 2.13 is true for all the irregular primes p. In the other hand, we know that $u+\zeta v\in K^{\times p}$ when SFLT2 fails for p regular, which leads us to set the conjecture:

Conjecture 3. *Let p be an odd prime. If SFLT2 conjecture fails for p then the solution(s) of the $SFLT2$ equation take(s) the reduced form $u+\zeta v\in K^{\times p}$.*

Remark 10. Note that the following probability estimates can in no way be considered as an element of a proof of conjecture 3. Suppose, as an example, that $SFLT2$ fails for p and that $p\|\mathcal{C}\ell_K$ class group of K, which implies that $Card(\mathcal{S})=1$. Under GRH, from [BDF], the definition of $\mathcal{S}$ should imply that $Q_p<12(p-2)^2(log\ p)^2$. For one $q\in\mathcal{S}$, the probability estimate $\mathcal{P}$ that $\mathfrak{q}$ splits totally in the Kummer extension

$$\mathbb{Q}(\xi,\zeta)\big(\sqrt[p]{<((1+\xi\zeta^k)\zeta^{-km})/((1+\xi\zeta)\zeta^{-1})>_{k=1,\dots,p-2}}\big)/\mathbb{Q}(\xi,\zeta)$$

of degree p^δ could be very roughly $\mathcal{P}<\mathcal{O}(\frac{Q_p}{p^\delta})$ because $\phi(q)<Q_p$ for $q\in\mathcal{S}$. The probability $\mathcal{P}'$ for the conjecture 3 be true for p could verify

$$1>\mathcal{P}'>1-\mathcal{O}(\frac{Q_p}{p^\delta}).$$

Note that often, and perhaps for all irregular primes $p>10^3$, we have $\delta>\frac{p}{4}$ and, under GRH we have $Q_p<p^3$, so *roughly*

$$1>\mathcal{P}'>1-\frac{1}{p^{\frac{p}{4}-3}}.$$

---

[8] We use intentionally the term *criterion* to indicate that the corollary 2.13 allows us (at least theoretically) in a finite number of arithmetic computations to prove that for p given the SFLT2 equation can be reduced to the form $u+\zeta v\in K^{\times p}$.

Remark 11.

1. The reduced form $u+\zeta v=\gamma^p$ can be an important tool to tackle the $SFLT2$ conjecture on a diophantine approach: we have $u+\zeta^k v = s_k(\gamma)^p$ for $k \not\equiv 0 \mod p$, which implies that

   $$(\zeta-\zeta^2)v = \gamma^p - s_2(\gamma^p),$$
   $$(\zeta^2-\zeta^3)v = s_2(\gamma^p) - s_3(\gamma^p),$$

   which brings, among a lot of possible strong diophantine equations, the *Fermat's type* equation

   $$\zeta\gamma^p + s_3(\gamma^p) - (1+\zeta)s_2(\gamma^p) = 0,$$

   where $s_k : \zeta \to \zeta^k$ is a $\mathbb{Q}$-isomorphism of K, form of equation which could be used to try to tackle SFLT2 conjecture, see for instance Washington [Was] chap 9 or Ribenboim [Rib1] chap. 3 or Cohen [Coh] 6.9.5 with some diophantine approachs of the second case.

   For instance, we can easily find again in this case a result we will also obtain in a broader context (theorem 3.4):

   $$\Big(\frac{1+\zeta^k}{\mathfrak{q}_K}\Big)_K = 1 \textit{ for all } k = 1,\dots,p-1,$$

   where $\mathfrak{q}_K$ *is any prime ideal dividing* $\gamma^p = u + v\zeta$*.*

2. More generally we can prove that: *If SFLT2 failed for* (p,u,v) *with* $u+\zeta v=\gamma^p$ *and* $p \mid v$*, then we should have*

   $$(s_k(\gamma) + \zeta_{p^2}^{k-1} s_{p-k+2}(\gamma))\mathbb{Z}_{K_{p^2}} = \mathfrak{W}_1^p \textit{ for } k = 2,3,\dots,p-4,$$

   where $s_k(\gamma)$ *are p-primary pseudo-units,* ζ_{p^2} *is the* p^2*th root of unity such that* $\zeta_{p^2}^p = \zeta$*,* $K_{p^2} = \mathbb{Q}(\zeta_{p^2})$*, and* $\mathfrak{W}_1$ *is an ideal of* $\mathbb{Z}_{K_{p^2}}$*.*

3. A strategy of proof of SFLT2 conjecture for the prime p could then be driven in two steps:
   (a) Reduce the SFLT2 equation to the form $u+\zeta v \in K^{\times p}$ implicitly if p is regular and by proving that the criterion of corollary 2.13 is verified for p if p is irregular.
   (b) Prove that the diophantine equation $u+\zeta v \in K^{\times p}$ with $p|v$ has no solution by a diophantine different approach.

3 On the second case of Fermat's Last Theorem

This section details some results obtained for the SFLT conjecture in the second case FLT2 of FLT theorem. The last subsection focus more particularly on some strong properties of the primes dividing $\frac{(x^p+y^p)(y^p+z^p)(z^p+x^p)}{(x+y)(y+z)(z+x)}$ or $\frac{(x^p-y^p)(y^p-z^p)(z^p-x^p)}{(x-y)(y-z)(z-x)}$ if FLT2 failed for (p,x,y,z) with $p|y$.

3.1 A conjecture for the second case of FLT

This subsection deals with an application of the previous results obtained for SFLT2 to the FLT2 context. We give a weak conjecture [9] which should imply the generalization to FLT2 of Terjanian's theorem for FLT1.

We call here *weak FLT2* theorem the assertion:[10]

Let p be an odd prime. There are no coprime integers $x, y, z \in \mathbb{Z}$, such that

$$x^p + y^p + z^p = 0,\ p|y, \tag{3}$$

with x and z square integers.

Let $x = \alpha^2,\ z = \beta^2, \alpha, \beta \in \mathbb{Z}$. Observe that the proof of this theorem is immediate as soon as $p \equiv 3 \mod 4$, because α and β are coprime and $x + z = \alpha^2 + \beta^2 \equiv 0 \mod p$, contradiction.

Lemma 3.1. *Suppose that p is a prime with $p \equiv 1 \mod 4$ and that x, y verify the Fermat's equation*

$$x^p + y^p + z^p = 0,\ p|y,\ x, y \text{ square integers}\ .$$

Let q be a prime with $q \equiv 3 \mod 4$ and p coprime to $\kappa = \frac{q^f - 1}{p}$ where f is the order of $q \mod p$. Then $q \not| \ xy(x^2 - y^2)$.

Proof. Suppose that $q|xy(x^2 - y^2)$. We have assumed that $p|y$, thus $x^2 - y^2 \not\equiv 0 \mod p$. We have p prime to κ, thus $x(x + y) \not\equiv 0 \mod q$ from the first theorem of Furtwangler and $x - y \not\equiv 0 \mod q$ from the second theorem of Furtwängler, so $y \equiv 0 \mod q$. From Barlow-Abel relations

$$x + z = p^{\nu p - 1} y_0^p,\ \frac{x^p + z^p}{x + z} = p y_1^p,\ y = -p^\nu y_0 y_1,\ \nu \geq 1,$$

If $y \equiv 0 \mod q$, then we cannot assert that $q^{p-1} - 1 \equiv 1 \bmod p^2$, because Furtwängler theorem cannot be applied here. Nevertheless we will show the reduced result:

if $q \neq p$ verifies $y \equiv 0 \mod q$ and $x + z \not\equiv 0 \mod q$ then $q - 1 \equiv 0 \mod p^2$:

Suppose that $q|\frac{x^p + z^p}{x + z}$ with p prime to κ and search for a contradiction: let $\mathfrak{q}_K$ be a prime ideal of $\mathbb{Z}_K$ lying over q. From $q|y$ and the Barlow-Abel relation $x + y = z_0^p$, we have so

$$\left(\frac{x}{\mathfrak{q}_K}\right)_K = \left(\frac{x + y}{\mathfrak{q}_K}\right)_K = \left(\frac{z_0^p}{\mathfrak{q}_K}\right)_K = 1.$$

Similarly $\left(\frac{z}{\mathfrak{q}_K}\right)_K = 1$, so $x^{(q-1)/p} - z^{(q-1)/p} \equiv 0 \mod \mathfrak{q}_K$. We get

$$q \mid x^{(q-1)/p} - z^{(q-1)/p} \text{ and } q \mid x^p + z^p.$$

---

[9] To avoid any misunderstanding, we mean by *weak conjecture*, a conjecture with weak assumptions that we could hope more easily reachable.

[10] This theorem is in the continuity for the second case $FLT2$ of the Terjanian theorem for the first case $FLT1$ [Ter] and Ribenboim [Rib1, 6C, p. 18].

If we suppose $\kappa = \frac{q-1}{p}$ prime to p, we have $\kappa = \frac{q-1}{p}$ even and $x^\kappa \equiv (-z)^\kappa \mod q$ and $x^p \equiv (-z)^p \mod q$, thus $q \mid x+z$ by a Bézout relation between p and n (absurd).

Therefore, all the prime factors r of y_1 (where $y = -y_0 y_1$) verify $r \equiv 1 \mod p^2$, thus $q | y_0$ because by assumption $p \| q-1$. Therefore

$$q \mid y_0 \mid x+z = \alpha^2 + \beta^2,$$

contradiction because $q \equiv 3 \mod 4$ and α, β are coprime, therefore $q \not| \; xy(x^2-y^2)$. $\square$

From $xy(x^2-y^2) \not\equiv 0 \mod q$ and from theorem 2.4, we are led to set the following conjecture independent of the Fermat context.

Conjecture 4. *"Let $p > 3$ be a prime. There exists at least one p-principal prime $q \equiv 3 \mod 4$ with p prime to $\kappa = \frac{q^f-1}{p}$ such that, for all the integers $n > 2$ dividing $q-1$, there is no prime ideal $\mathfrak{q}$ of $\mathbb{Z}[\xi]$ above q which splits totally in the Kummer extension*

$$\mathbb{Q}(\xi, \zeta)\left(\sqrt[p]{< (1+\xi\zeta^k)/(1+\xi\zeta) >_{k=1,\dots,p-2}}\right)/\mathbb{Q}(\xi, \zeta)$$

where $\xi := e^{\frac{2\pi i}{n}}$."

Theorem 3.2. *If the conjecture 4 is true then the weak $FLT2$ theorem is true.*[11]

Proof.

Suppose that conjecture 4 is true and weak $FLT2$ theorem is false and search for a contradiction:

(i) If $p \equiv 3 \mod 4$: it results directly from $x+z = \alpha^2 + \beta^2 \equiv 0 \mod p$ impossible, contradiction.

(ii) If $p \equiv 1 \mod 4$: there exists at least one prime $q \equiv 3 \mod p$ with $p \| q^{p-1} - 1$ verifying the conjecture 4. Then $xy(x^2-y^2) \not\equiv 0 \mod p$ from lemma 3.1, so we can apply theorem 2.4 to this prime q: the decomposition of q in a Kummer extension given in the theorem 2.4 contradicts the decomposition of q given in the conjecture 4, for the same extension, contradiction which achieves the proof.

$\square$

Remark 12.

1. The conjecture 4 independent of Fermat is highly probable, considering, with a probabilistic approach, that it suffices to take the smallest p-principal primes q with $p \| q^{p-1} - 1$ and $q \equiv 3 \mod 4$ to find easily at least one of them with conjecture 4 verified. Suppose $p > 125000$

---

[11] This theorem and the Terjanian theorem imply that if the conjecture 4 is true then the Fermat equation $x^{2p} + y^{2p} + z^{2p} = 0$ has no solutions with x, y, z nonzero integers.

(we know in the classical approach that $FLT2$ is true for $p < 125000$, see Ribenboim [Rib1, p. 199]). In practice we will find, with these assumptions on q, some primes $q \ll p$ with a *very large* probability that the conjecture 4 is true for at least one of these primes q.

2. As an example, we suggest that a very rough estimate of the probability $\mathcal{P}(p)$ that the conjecture 4 be true at p (so implying weak $FLT2$ theorem at p) for the first prime p greater than 125000) verify:

$$1 - \Big(\prod_{\substack{q \text{ prime } p-\text{principal} \\ q< 20000,\, q\equiv 3 \mod 4 \\ p\| q^{p-1}-1}} \frac{1}{q^{30000}} \Big) \; < \; \mathcal{P}(p) \quad \leq 1.$$

Note that this probability estimate can in no way be considered as an element of a proof of the weak FLT2 theorem.

3.2 Some properties of the primes q dividing $\frac{(x^p-y^p)(y^p-z^p)(z^p-x^p)}{(x-y)(y-z)(z-x)}$

We assume that the second case $FLT2$ fails for (p, x, y, z) with $p|y$. In this subsection, we give, for a possible future use, some general strong properties of decomposition of the primes q dividing $\frac{(x^p-y^p)(y^p-z^p)(z^p-x^p)}{(x-y)(y-z)(z-x)}$ in certain p-Kummer extensions. Here, we don't assume that q is p-principal or not, thus this subsection brings complementary informations to corollary 2.5. The Furtwangler's theorem cannot be used for these primes q, so we don't know if $p^2|q-1$ or not.

Let us define here the totally real cyclotomic units

$$\epsilon_a =: \zeta^{(1-a)/2} \cdot \frac{1+\zeta^a}{1+\zeta}, \; 1 \leq a \leq p-1,$$

where we observe that $\epsilon_1 = 1$ with this definition. [12] Let us note that

$$\varepsilon_{p-a} = \zeta^{(1-(p-a))/2} \cdot \frac{1+\zeta^{p-a}}{1+\zeta} = \zeta^{(1+a)/2} \cdot \frac{1+\zeta^{-a}}{1+\zeta} = \zeta^{(1-a)/2} \frac{1+\zeta^a}{1+\zeta} = \varepsilon_a. \tag{4}$$

Lemma 3.3. *Suppose that $FLT2$ fails for (p, x, y, z) with $p|y$. Let $q \neq p$ be a prime and $\mathfrak{q}_K$ be a prime ideal of $\mathbb{Z}_K$ over q. Then we have for $k = 1, \dots, p-1$:*

(i) If $\mathfrak{q}_K | x\zeta - y$ then $\left(\frac{x+\zeta^k y}{\mathfrak{q}_K}\right)_K = \left(\frac{\zeta^{k/2}}{\mathfrak{q}_K}\right)_K \left(\frac{\epsilon_{k+1}}{\mathfrak{q}_K}\right)_K$.

(ii) If $\mathfrak{q}_K | z\zeta - y$ then $\left(\frac{z+\zeta^k y}{\mathfrak{q}_K}\right)_K = \left(\frac{\zeta^{k/2}}{\mathfrak{q}_K}\right)_K \left(\frac{\epsilon_{k+1}}{\mathfrak{q}_K}\right)_K$.

(iii) If $\mathfrak{q}_K | x\zeta - z$ then $\left(\frac{x+\zeta^k z}{\mathfrak{q}_K}\right)_K \left(\frac{p}{\mathfrak{q}_K}\right)_K = \left(\frac{\zeta^{k/2}}{\mathfrak{q}_K}\right)_K \left(\frac{\epsilon_{k+1}}{\mathfrak{q}_K}\right)_K$.

---

[12] Be careful, ϵ_a (epsilon in Latex) is different of the Vandiver cyclotomic unit $\varepsilon_a =: 1 + \xi\zeta^a$ (varepsilon in Latex) defined in the definition 4.

Proof.

(i) From $x\zeta - y \equiv 0 \mod \mathfrak{q}_K$ we get

$$x + \zeta^k y \equiv x(1 + \zeta^{k+1}) \mod \mathfrak{q}_K,\ k = 1, \dots, p-1.$$

thus

$$\frac{x + \zeta^k y}{x + y} \equiv \frac{1 + \zeta^{k+1}}{1 + \zeta} \mod \mathfrak{q}_K,\ \text{for } k = 1, \dots, p-1.$$

In the other hand, for $1 \leq k \leq p-2$ then $\epsilon_{k+1} = \zeta^{(1-(k+1))/2} \cdot \frac{1+\zeta^{k+1}}{1+\zeta}$ is a totally real cyclotomic unit, so $\frac{x+\zeta^k y}{x+y} \equiv \epsilon_{k+1}\zeta^{k/2} \mod \mathfrak{q}_K,\ k = 1, \dots p-1$, and finally

$$\Big(\frac{x + \zeta^k y}{\mathfrak{q}_K}\Big)_K = \Big(\frac{\zeta^{k/2}}{\mathfrak{q}_K}\Big)_K \Big(\frac{\epsilon_{k+1}}{\mathfrak{q}_K}\Big)_K \text{ for } k = 1, \dots, p-2,$$

because $x + y \in K^{\times p}$. [13]

(ii) the proof is similar with z in place of x.

(iii) In that case we have $x + z = p^{\nu p - 1} y_0^p$ with $\nu > 0$ and so $x + z \in p^{-1} K^{\times p}$. □

Remark 13. This property of the primes q dividing $\frac{x^p - y^p}{x-y}$ or $\frac{y^p - z^p}{y-z}$, or $\frac{x^p - z^p}{x-z}$ is strong because $x + \zeta^k y$ or $y + \zeta^k z$, or $\frac{x+\zeta^k z}{1-\zeta^k}$) and ϵ_{k+1} are pseudo-units not linearly connected by an action of $\mathbb{F}_p[g]$.

Theorem 3.4. *Suppose that the second case of FLT fails for (p, x, y, z) with $p|y$. Let q be a prime dividing $\frac{x^p - y^p}{x-y}$ (or $\frac{y^p - z^p}{y-z}$). Let $\mathfrak{q}_K$ be the prime ideal of $\mathbb{Z}_K$ over q dividing $x\zeta - y$ (or $z\zeta - y$). Assume that the p-class $c\ell(\mathfrak{q}_K) \in C\ell^-$.* [14]

(i) If $p^2 \not| \ q-1$ then q is not p-principal and

$$\Big(\frac{\epsilon_{p-2k'-1}}{\mathfrak{q}_K}\Big)_K = \Big(\frac{\zeta^{-k'(k'+1)}}{\mathfrak{q}_K}\Big)_K \text{ for } 1 \leq k' \leq \frac{p-3}{2},$$

and

$$\Big(\frac{\epsilon_{p-2k'}}{\mathfrak{q}_K}\Big)_K = \Big(\frac{\zeta^{\frac{1}{4} - k'^2}}{\mathfrak{q}_K}\Big)_K \text{ for } 1 \leq k' \leq \frac{p-3}{2}.$$

(ii) If $p^2 |\ q-1$ then

$$\Big(\frac{1 + \zeta^j}{\mathfrak{q}_K}\Big)_K = 1 \text{ for } j = 1, \dots p-1.$$

---

[13] We don't know here if $p^2 | q-1$.

[14] Note that as soon as Vandiver's conjecture is true for p, this assumption is verified.

Proof.

(i) Let us suppose at first that $p^2 \not| \; q-1$: We know that q is not p-principal, if not it should imply $p^2|q-1$ from corollary 2.5.

- From previous lemma 3.6, we have

$$\Big(\frac{x+\zeta^k y}{\mathfrak{q}_K}\Big)_K = \Big(\frac{\zeta^{k/2}}{\mathfrak{q}_K}\Big)_K \Big(\frac{\epsilon_{k+1}}{\mathfrak{q}_K}\Big)_K \text{ for } k = 1, \dots, p-2, \tag{5}$$

and so, with $p-k$ in place of k,

$$\Big(\frac{x+\zeta^{p-k} y}{\mathfrak{q}_K}\Big)_K = \Big(\frac{\zeta^{(p-k)/2}}{\mathfrak{q}_K}\Big)_K \Big(\frac{\epsilon_{p-k+1}}{\mathfrak{q}_K}\Big)_K \text{ for } p-k = 1, \dots, p-2. \tag{6}$$

- For $2 \leq k \leq p-2$, we can write $x+\zeta^k y = A_k B_k \alpha^p$ with $\alpha \in K^{\times p}$, pseudo-units A_k, B_k verifying $A_k^{s_{-1}+1} \in K^{\times p}$ and $B_k^{s_{-1}-1} \in K^{\times p}$ where we recall that s_k is the $\mathbb{Q}$-isomorphism $s_k : \zeta \rightarrow \zeta^k$ of K. Let $\Big(\frac{A_k}{\mathfrak{q}_K}\Big)_K = \zeta^w$, we get

$$\Big(\frac{A_k^{s_{-1}}}{s_{-1}(\mathfrak{q}_K)}\Big)_K = \Big(\frac{A_k^{-1}}{s_{-1}(\mathfrak{q}_K)}\Big)_K = \zeta^{-w},$$

so $\Big(\frac{A_k}{s_{-1}(\mathfrak{q}_K)}\Big)_K = \zeta^w$, and so $\Big(\frac{A_k}{\mathfrak{q}_K s_{-1}(\mathfrak{q}_K)}\Big)_K = \zeta^{2w}$. But $c\ell(\mathfrak{q}_K) \in C\ell^-$, so $(\mathfrak{q}_K s_{-1}(\mathfrak{q}_K))^n \mathbb{Z}_K = \beta \mathbb{Z}_K$ with $\beta \in \mathbb{Z}_K$ and $gcd(n,p) = 1$. Then

$$\Big(\frac{A_k}{\mathfrak{q}_K^n s_{-1}(\mathfrak{q}_K)^n}\Big)_K = \Big(\frac{A_k}{\beta}\Big)_K = 1,$$

because A_k is a p-primary pseudo-unit (for instance by application of Artin-Hasse reciprocity law), so $w = 0$ and $\Big(\frac{A_k}{\mathfrak{q}_K}\Big)_K = 1$.

- We get $\frac{x+\zeta^k y}{x+\zeta^{p-k} y} \in A_k^2 \times K^{\times p}$, so

$$\Big(\frac{x+\zeta^k y}{\mathfrak{q}_K}\Big) = \Big(\frac{x+\zeta^{p-k} y}{\mathfrak{q}_K}\Big)_K \text{ for } \; k = 2, \dots, p-2, \tag{7}$$

which leads from (5) and (6) to

$$\Big(\frac{\epsilon_{p-k+1}}{\mathfrak{q}_K}\Big)_K = \Big(\frac{\zeta^k}{\mathfrak{q}_K}\Big)_K \Big(\frac{\epsilon_{k+1}}{\mathfrak{q}_K}\Big)_K \text{ for } k = 2, \dots, p-2. \tag{8}$$

- In the other hand, from (4) we have

$$\epsilon_{p-k-1} = \epsilon_{k+1} : \tag{9}$$

From (8) and (9) we derive that

$$\Big(\frac{\epsilon_{p-k-1}}{\mathfrak{q}_K}\Big)_K=\Big(\frac{\zeta^{-k}}{\mathfrak{q}_K}\Big)_K\Big(\frac{\epsilon_{p-k+1}}{\mathfrak{q}_K}\Big)_K \text{ for k=2,...,p-2.} \tag{10}$$

- We get for the values $k=2k'$ even

$$\Big(\frac{\epsilon_{p-2k'-1}}{\mathfrak{q}_K}\Big)_K=\Big(\frac{\zeta^{-2k'}}{\mathfrak{q}_K}\Big)_K\Big(\frac{\epsilon_{p-2k'+1}}{\mathfrak{q}_K}\Big)_K \text{ for } 1\leq k'\leq\frac{p-3}{2}.$$

Observing that $\epsilon_{p-1}=1$, so $\Big(\frac{\epsilon_{p-1}}{\mathfrak{q}_K}\Big)_K=1$ we get inductively

$$\Big(\frac{\epsilon_{p-2k'-1}}{\mathfrak{q}_K}\Big)_K=\Big(\frac{\zeta^{-\sum_{j=1}^{k'}2j}}{\mathfrak{q}_K}\Big)_K\Big(\frac{\epsilon_{p-1}}{\mathfrak{q}_K}\Big)_K \text{ for } k'=1,2,\dots,\frac{p-3}{2},$$

so

$$\Big(\frac{\epsilon_{p-2k'-1}}{\mathfrak{q}_K}\Big)_K=\Big(\frac{\zeta^{-k'(k'+1)}}{\mathfrak{q}_K}\Big)_K \text{ for } 0\leq k'\leq\frac{p-3}{2}.$$

- We get for the odd values $k=2k'+1$

$$\Big(\frac{\epsilon_{p-(2k'+1)-1)}}{\mathfrak{q}_K}\Big)_K=\Big(\frac{\zeta^{-(2k'+1)}}{\mathfrak{q}_K}\Big)_K\Big(\frac{\epsilon_{p-(2k'+1)+1}}{\mathfrak{q}_K}\Big)_K \text{ for } k'=\frac{p-3}{2},\frac{p-5}{2}\dots,1,$$

so

$$\Big(\frac{\epsilon_{p-2k'}}{\mathfrak{q}_K}\Big)_K=\Big(\frac{\zeta^{2k'+1}}{\mathfrak{q}_K}\Big)_K\Big(\frac{\epsilon_{p-2k'-2}}{\mathfrak{q}_K}\Big)_K \text{ for } k'=\frac{p-3}{2},\frac{p-5}{2}\dots,1.$$

Observing that $\epsilon_1=1$, so $\Big(\frac{\epsilon_1}{\mathfrak{q}_K}\Big)_K=1$ we get for $k'=\frac{p-3}{2}$, so $2k'+1=p-2$,

$$\Big(\frac{\epsilon_3}{\mathfrak{q}_K}\Big)_K=\Big(\frac{\zeta^{-2}}{\mathfrak{q}_K}\Big)_K\Big(\frac{\epsilon_1}{\mathfrak{q}_K}\Big)_K,$$

and for $k'=\frac{p-5}{2}$

$$\Big(\frac{\epsilon_5}{\mathfrak{q}_K}\Big)_K=\Big(\frac{\zeta^{-4}}{\mathfrak{q}_K}\Big)_K\Big(\frac{\epsilon_3}{\mathfrak{q}_K}\Big)_K,$$

and so on.

- Let us define $k" :=\frac{p-1}{2}-k'$, we get

$$2k'+1=p-2k",\ \text{ for } k'=\frac{p-3}{2},\dots,1 \text{ corresponding to } \ k"=1,\dots,\frac{p-3}{2}.$$

It follows that

$$\Big(\frac{\epsilon_{p-2k'}}{\mathfrak{q}_K}\Big)_K=\Big(\frac{\zeta^{\sum_{j=1}^{k"}-2j}}{\mathfrak{q}_K}\Big)_K\Big(\frac{\epsilon_1}{\mathfrak{q}_K}\Big)_K \text{ for } k'=\frac{p-3}{2},\frac{p-5}{2},\dots,1,$$

so

$$\Big(\frac{\epsilon_{p-2k'}}{\mathfrak{q}_K}\Big)_K = \Big(\frac{\zeta^{-k''(k''+1)}}{\mathfrak{q}_K}\Big)_K \text{ for } 1 \leq k' \leq \frac{p-3}{2},$$

so

$$\Big(\frac{\epsilon_{p-2k'}}{\mathfrak{q}_K}\Big)_K = \Big(\frac{\zeta^{-(\frac{p-1}{2}-k')(\frac{p-1}{2}-k'+1)}}{\mathfrak{q}_K}\Big)_K \text{ for } 1 \leq k' \leq \frac{p-3}{2},$$

and finally

$$\Big(\frac{\epsilon_{p-2k'}}{\mathfrak{q}_K}\Big)_K = \Big(\frac{\zeta^{\frac{1}{4}-k'^2}}{\mathfrak{q}_K}\Big)_K \text{ for } 1 \leq k' \leq \frac{p-3}{2}.$$

(ii) Let us suppose that $q \equiv 1 \mod p^2$: then $\Big(\frac{\zeta}{\mathfrak{q}_K}\Big)_K = 1$ and from relation (10) we get

$$\Big(\frac{\epsilon_{p-k-1}}{\mathfrak{q}_K}\Big)_K = \Big(\frac{\epsilon_{p-k+1}}{\mathfrak{q}_K}\Big)_K \text{ for } k = 2, \dots, p-2.$$

In the other hand we have $\Big(\frac{\epsilon_{p-1}}{\mathfrak{q}_K}\Big)_K = \Big(\frac{\epsilon_1}{\mathfrak{q}_K}\Big)_K = 1$ and so

$$\Big(\frac{\epsilon_j}{\mathfrak{q}_K}\Big)_K = 1 \text{ for } j = 1, \dots, p-1.$$

A straightforward computation shows that $\Big(\frac{\epsilon_1 \dots \epsilon_{p-1}}{\mathfrak{q}_K}\Big)_K = \Big(\frac{1+\zeta}{\mathfrak{q}_K}\Big)_K$ and we derive that

$$\Big(\frac{1+\zeta}{\mathfrak{q}_K}\Big)_K = 1,$$

and finally that

$$\Big(\frac{1+\zeta^j}{\mathfrak{q}_K}\Big)_K = 1 \text{ for } j = 1, \dots, p-1.$$

which achieves the proof for $p^2 | q-1$. $\square$

3.3 Some properties of the primes q dividing $\frac{(x^p+y^p)(y^p+z^p)(z^p+x^p)}{(x+y)(y+z)(z+x)}$

We assume that $FLT2$ fails for (p, x, y, z). In this section, we give, for a possible future use, some general strong properties of the primes q dividing $\frac{(x^p+y^p)(y^p+z^p)(z^p+x^p)}{(x+y)(y+z)(z+x)}$ in the second case of FLT. Here, we don't assume that q is p-principal or not, thus this subsection brings complementary informations to corollary 2.8.

Let us define the totally real cyclotomic units

$$\varpi_a =: \zeta^{(1-a)/2} \cdot \frac{1-\zeta^a}{1-\zeta},\ 1 \leq a \leq p-1,$$

where we observe that $\varpi_1 = 1$ with this definition. Recall that the cyclotomic units of K are generated by the ϖ_a for $1 < a < \frac{p}{2}$. With this definition we have $\varpi_a = -\varpi_{p-a}$: indeed we have $\varpi_a = \zeta^{(1-a)/2} \cdot \frac{1-\zeta^a}{1-\zeta}$ and $\varpi_{p-a} = \zeta^{(1-(p-a))/2} \cdot \frac{1-\zeta^{p-a}}{1-\zeta} = \zeta^{(1+a)/2} \cdot \frac{1-\zeta^{-a}}{1-\zeta} = \zeta^{1-a)/2} \cdot \frac{\zeta^a-1}{1-\zeta} = -\varpi_a$.

Lemma 3.5. *Assume that FLT2 fails for* (p, x, y, z) *with* $p|y$ *. Let* $\mathfrak{q}_K$ *be a prime ideal of* $\mathbb{Z}_K$ *such that* $x\zeta + y \equiv 0 \mod \mathfrak{q}_K$ *(or* $z\zeta + y \equiv 0 \mod \mathfrak{q}_K$*). Then*

$$q \equiv 1 \mod p^2 \text{ and } \Big(\frac{\zeta}{\mathfrak{q}_K}\Big)_K = \Big(\frac{p}{\mathfrak{q}_K}\Big)_K = \Big(\frac{1-\zeta}{\mathfrak{q}_K}\Big)_K = 1.$$

Proof.

- Suppose that $x\zeta + y \equiv 0 \mod \mathfrak{q}_K$. We have $q|z$, so $q \equiv 1 \mod p^2$ from First Furtwangler's theorem, so $\Big(\frac{\zeta}{\mathfrak{q}_K}\Big)_K = 1$ and $\Big(\frac{x}{\mathfrak{q}_K}\Big)_K = \Big(\frac{y}{\mathfrak{q}_K}\Big)_K$, so $\Big(\frac{x+z}{\mathfrak{q}_K}\Big)_K = \Big(\frac{y+z}{\mathfrak{q}_K}\Big)_K$, so $\Big(\frac{p^{\nu p-1}y_0^p}{\mathfrak{q}_K}\Big)_K = \Big(\frac{x_0^p}{\mathfrak{q}_K}\Big)_K$, and finally $\Big(\frac{p}{\mathfrak{q}_K}\Big)_K = 1$. In the other hand, we have

$$x + y = z_0^p \equiv x(1-\zeta) \equiv (x+z)(1-\zeta) \equiv p^{\nu p-1}y_0^p(1-\zeta) \mod \mathfrak{q}_K,$$

so

$$\Big(\frac{1-\zeta}{\mathfrak{q}_K}\Big)_K = 1.$$

- Suppose that $z\zeta + y \equiv 0 \mod \mathfrak{q}_K$. The proof is similar with z in place of x.

□

Lemma 3.6. *Suppose that* $FLT2$ *fails for* (p, x, y, z) *with* $p|y$ *. Let* $q \neq p$ *be a prime and* $\mathfrak{q}_K$ *be a prime ideal of* $\mathbb{Z}_K$ *over* q*. Then we have for* $k = 1, \dots, p-2$*:*

(i) If $\mathfrak{q}_K$ *divides* $x\zeta + y$ *then* $\Big(\frac{x+\zeta^k y}{\mathfrak{q}_K}\Big)_K = \Big(\frac{\varpi_{k+1}}{\mathfrak{q}_K}\Big)_K$.

(ii) If $\mathfrak{q}_K$ *divides* $z\zeta + y$ *then* $\Big(\frac{z+\zeta^k y}{\mathfrak{q}_K}\Big)_K = \Big(\frac{\varpi_{k+1}}{\mathfrak{q}_K}\Big)_K$.

(iii) If $\mathfrak{q}_K$ *divides* $x\zeta + z$ *and* $p \mid y$ *then* $\Big(\frac{x+\zeta^k z}{\mathfrak{q}_K}\Big)_K \Big(\frac{p}{\mathfrak{q}_K}\Big)_K = \Big(\frac{\varpi_{k+1}}{\mathfrak{q}_K}\Big)_K$.

Proof.

(i) From $x\zeta + y \equiv 0 \mod \mathfrak{q}_K$ we get

$$x + \zeta^k y \equiv x(1-\zeta^{k+1}) \mod \mathfrak{q}_K,\ k = 1, \dots, p-2.$$

thus

$$\frac{x+\zeta^k y}{x+y} \equiv \frac{1-\zeta^{k+1}}{1-\zeta} \mod \mathfrak{q}_K,\ \text{for } k = 1, \dots, p-2.$$

In the other hand $\varpi_{k+1} = \zeta^{(1-(k+1))/2} \cdot \frac{1-\zeta^{k+1}}{1-\zeta}$ is a totally real cyclotomic unit, so

$$\frac{x+\zeta^k y}{x+y} \equiv \varpi_{k+1}\zeta^{k/2} \mod \mathfrak{q}_K,\ \text{for } k = 1, \dots p-2,$$

so

$$\Big(\frac{x+\zeta^k y}{\mathfrak{q}_K}\Big)_K = \Big(\frac{\varpi_{k+1}}{\mathfrak{q}_K}\Big)_K \Big(\frac{\zeta^{k/2}}{\mathfrak{q}_K}\Big)_K \text{ for } k = 1, \dots, p-2,$$

because $x+y \in K^{\times p}$ and finally

$$\Big(\frac{x+\zeta^k y}{\mathfrak{q}_K}\Big)_K = \Big(\frac{\varpi_{k+1}}{\mathfrak{q}_K}\Big)_K \text{ for } k=1,\dots,p-2,$$

because $q \equiv 1 \mod p^2$ obtained by the first Theorem of Furtwängler.

(ii) The proof is similar to (i) with z in place of x.

(iii) In that case we have $x+z = p^{\nu p-1} y_0^p$ with $\nu > 0$ and so $x+z \in p^{-1}K^{\times p}$ and $p^2 | q-1$ as shown in third paragraph of proof of lemma 3.1. □

Remark 14. This property of the primes q dividing $\frac{x^p+y^p}{x+y}$ (or $\frac{z^p+y^p}{z+y}$, or $\frac{x^p+z^p}{x+z}$) is strong because $x\zeta+y$ (or $z\zeta+y$, or $\frac{x+\zeta z}{1-\zeta}$)), and ϖ_{k+1} of $\mathbb{Z}_K$ are pseudo-units not linearly connected in the action of $\mathbb{F}_p[g]$.

Theorem 3.7. *Suppose that the second case of FLT fails for (p,x,y,z) with $p|y$. Let q be a prime dividing $\frac{x^p+y^p}{x+y}$ (or $\frac{z^p+y^p}{z+y}$ or $\frac{x^p+z^p}{x+z}$). Let $\mathfrak{q}_K$ be the prime ideal of $\mathbb{Z}_K$ over q dividing $x\zeta+y$ (or $z\zeta+y$ or $x\zeta+z$). Assume that the p-class $c\ell(\mathfrak{q}_K) \in C\ell^-$.*[15] [16] *Then we have*

1. *$q \equiv 1 \mod p^2$ and q is p-principal.*
2. *$\mathfrak{q}_K$ verifies the power symbols following values:*
   - *(a) If $\mathfrak{q}_K | x\zeta+y$ (or $z\zeta+y$) then*

$$\Big(\frac{p}{\mathfrak{q}_K}\Big)_K = \Big(\frac{1-\zeta^j}{\mathfrak{q}_K}\Big)_K = 1 \text{ for } j=1,\dots,p-1.$$

   - *(b) If $\mathfrak{q}_K | x\zeta+z$ then*

$$\Big(\frac{p}{\mathfrak{q}_K}\Big)_K = \Big(\frac{1-\zeta^j}{\mathfrak{q}_K}\Big)_K \text{ for } j=1,\dots,p-1.$$

Proof.

(a) Suppose at first that $q|\frac{x^p+y^p}{x+y}$: From Furtwangler's First theorem, if a prime $q|\frac{x^p+y^p}{x+y}\frac{y^p+z^p}{y+z}$ then $q \equiv 1 \mod p^2$. We derive that $\Big(\frac{\zeta}{\mathfrak{q}_K}\Big)_K = 1$ and from lemma 3.5 that $\Big(\frac{p}{\mathfrak{q}_K}\Big)_K = 1$.

- From previous lemma 3.6, we have

$$\Big(\frac{x+\zeta^k y}{\mathfrak{q}_K}\Big)_K = \Big(\frac{\varpi_{k+1}}{\mathfrak{q}_K}\Big)_K \text{ for } k=1,\dots,p-2,$$

and also, with $p-k$ in place of k,

$$\Big(\frac{x+\zeta^{p-k} y}{\mathfrak{q}_K}\Big)_K = \Big(\frac{\varpi_{p-k+1}}{\mathfrak{q}_K}\Big)_K \text{ for } p-k=1,\dots,p-2.$$

---

[15] See the paragraph of notations 1 for the meaning of the p-class $c\ell$ and the p-class group $C\ell^-$.

[16] Note that the assumption $c\ell(\mathfrak{q}_K) \in C\ell^-$ is automatically verified as soon as Vandiver's conjecture holds for p.

- The relation (7) of theorem 3.4 can be obtained with exactly the same proof

$$\Big(\frac{x+\zeta^k y}{\mathfrak{q}_K}\Big)= \Big(\frac{x+\zeta^{p-k} y}{\mathfrak{q}_K}\Big)_K \text{ for } \ k=2,\dots,p-2, \tag{11}$$

which leads to

$$\Big(\frac{\varpi_{k+1}}{\mathfrak{q}_K}\Big)_K = \Big(\frac{\varpi_{p-k+1}}{\mathfrak{q}_K}\Big)_K \text{ for } k=2,\dots,p-2.$$

- We have seen above that $\varpi_{k+1} = -\varpi_{p-k-1}$ so

$$\Big(\frac{\varpi_{k+1}}{\mathfrak{q}_K}\Big)_K = \Big(\frac{\varpi_{p-(k+1)}}{\mathfrak{q}_K}\Big)_K \text{ for } k=2,\dots,p-2.$$

Then, gathering these two relations, we get

$$\Big(\frac{\varpi_{p-k+1}}{\mathfrak{q}_K}\Big)_K = \Big(\frac{\varpi_{p-k-1}}{\mathfrak{q}_K}\Big)_K \text{ for } k=2,\dots,p-2.$$

- Starting from $k=2$ we get for $k=2,4,\dots,p-3$,

$$\Big(\frac{\varpi_{p-1}}{\mathfrak{q}_K}\Big)_K = \Big(\frac{\varpi_{p-3}}{\mathfrak{q}_K}\Big)_K = \dots = \Big(\frac{\varpi_{2}}{\mathfrak{q}_K}\Big)_K = 1,$$

because we get directly $\Big(\frac{\varpi_{p-1}}{\mathfrak{q}_K}\Big)_K = 1$ from its definition. Starting from $k=3$ we get for $k = 3,5,\dots,p-2$,

$$\Big(\frac{\varpi_{p-2}}{\mathfrak{q}_K}\Big)_K = \Big(\frac{\varpi_{p-4}}{\mathfrak{q}_K}\Big)_K = \dots = \Big(\frac{\varpi_{1}}{\mathfrak{q}_K}\Big)_K = 1,$$

because we get directly $\Big(\frac{\varpi_{1}}{\mathfrak{q}_K}\Big)_K = 1$ from its definition. Therefore we get

$$\Big(\frac{\varpi_{i}}{\mathfrak{q}_K}\Big)_K = 1 \text{ for } i=1,\dots,p-1,$$

and finally we find again $\Big(\frac{p}{\mathfrak{q}_K}\Big)_K = \Big(\frac{1-\zeta}{\mathfrak{q}_K}\Big)_K$, seen in lemma 3.5. From this lemma we have also $\Big(\frac{1-\zeta}{\mathfrak{q}_K}\Big)_K = 1$ if $\mathfrak{q}_K | x\zeta+y$ (or $\mathfrak{q}_K | z\zeta+y$).

- The even p-primary units are all generated by the $\varpi_i, \quad i=1,\dots,\frac{p-1}{2}$. Therefore, the result $\Big(\frac{\varpi_{i}}{\mathfrak{q}_K}\Big)_K = 1$ for $i=1,\dots,p-1$ obtained and the assumption that $c\ell(\mathfrak{q}_K) \in C\ell^-$ imply that $\mathfrak{q}_K$ is p-principal (application of the decomposition and reflection theorems in the p-Hilbert class field of K), if not it should be possible to find integers $n_1,\dots,n_{(p-3)/2} \not\equiv 0 \mod p$, such that the p-primary unit $\varpi = \prod_{i=1}^{(p-3)/2} \varpi_i^{n_i}$ verifies $\Big(\frac{\varpi}{\mathfrak{q}_K}\Big)_K \neq 1$, contradiction.

(b) The proof is similar if $q | \frac{z^p+y^p}{z+y}$.

(c) Suppose at last that $q|\frac{x^p+z^p}{x+z}$: If $\mathfrak{q}_K|x\zeta+z$ and $p \mid y$ then

$$\Big(\frac{x+\zeta^k z}{\mathfrak{q}_K}\Big)_K\Big(\frac{p}{\mathfrak{q}_K}\Big)_K = \Big(\frac{\varpi_{k+1}}{\mathfrak{q}_K}\Big)_K,$$

(seen in lemma 3.6 (iii)) and similarly

$$\Big(\frac{x+\zeta^{p-k} z}{\mathfrak{q}_K}\Big)_K\Big(\frac{p}{\mathfrak{q}_K}\Big)_K = \Big(\frac{\varpi_{p-k+1}}{\mathfrak{q}_K}\Big)_K,$$

so we get again

$$\Big(\frac{x+\zeta^k z}{x+\zeta^{p-k} z}\Big)_K = \Big(\frac{\varpi_{k+1}\varpi_{p-k+1}^{-1}}{\mathfrak{q}_K}\Big)_K.$$

In the other hand $\frac{x+\zeta^k z}{x+\zeta^{p-k}z} = \zeta^k A$ where A is a p-primary pseudo unit with $A^{s_{-1}+1} \in K^{\times p}$. Then the end of the proof is similar to the previous cases taking into account that we know that $p^2|q-1$ from an argument in proof of lemma 3.1 as soon $q \neq p$ dividing $\frac{x^p+z^p}{x+z}$, so $\Big(\frac{\zeta^k}{\mathfrak{q}_K}\Big)_K = 1$. □

Remark 15. In the case of an hypothetic solution (x, y, z), $p|y$ of the FLT2 equation, for the primes q with $c\ell(\mathfrak{q}_K) \in C\ell^-$ and $\mathfrak{q}_K|x\zeta+y$ (or $z\zeta+y$), the theorem 3.7 can be considered as a reciprocal statement to corollary 2.8 in which $(u, v) = (x, y)$ or (z, y) for x, y, z, $p|y$ hypothetic solution of the Fermat's equation. In particular, we have proved:

If Vandiver's conjecture holds for p, and if the second case of FLT fails for p then all the primes $q \mid \frac{(x^p+y^p)(y^p+z^p)(z^p+x^p)}{(x+y)(y+z)(z+x)}$ *are p-principal.*

Acknowledgments: I would like to thank Georges Gras for pointing out many errors in the preliminary versions and for suggesting many improvements to me for the content and form of the article.

References

[BDF] K. Belabas, F. Diaz Y Diaz, and E. Friedman, *Small generators of the ideal class group*, Mathematics of Computation 77, 262 (2008) 1185–1197.

[Coh] H. Cohen, *Number Theory Volume 1: Tools and Diophantine equations*, Springer, 2007.

[Fur] P. Furtwängler, *Letzter Fermatschen Satz und Eisensteins'ches Reciprozitätsgesetz*, Sitzungsber, Akad. d. Wiss. Wien., Abt. IIa, 121, 1912, 589–592.

[Gr1] G. Gras, *Class Field Theory, From Theory to Practice*, Springer, 2003.

[Gr2] G. Gras, *Analysis of the classical cyclotomic approach of Fermat's Last Theorem*, Publications Mathématiques de Besançon, 2010.

[GQ] G. Gras and R. Quême, *Some Furtwängler and Vandiver works revisited and the Fermat last theorem*, preprint 2011, arXiv.org

[Rib1] P. Ribenboim, *13 Lectures on Fermat's Last Theorem*, Springer-Verlag, 1979.

[Ter] G. Terjanian, *Sur l'équation* $x^{2p} + y^{2p} = z^{2p}$, C.R. Acad. Sci. Paris, 285,1977, 973–975.

[Va1] H.S. Vandiver, *Summary of results and proofs concerning Fermat's Last Theorem*, proceedings of National Academy of Sciences, Jan 6, 1926, p. 106.

[Va2] H.S. Vandiver, *Summary of results and proofs concerning Fermat's Last Theorem (second note)*, proceedings of National Academy of Sciences, Oct 21, 1926, p. 767.

[Was] L.C. Washington, *Introduction to cyclotomic fields, second edition*, Springer, 1997.

Roland Quême
13 avenue du château d'eau
31490 Brax
France
mailto: roland.queme@wanadoo.fr